

FAX TRANSMISSION

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 11 2005

**ExxonMobil Upstream Research Company
LAW DEPARTMENT
P. O. Box 2189
Houston, Texas 77252-2189 U.S.A.
Fax Number: 713-431-4664**

TO: Examiner Kiley S. Stoner Facsimile #703-872-9306
U. S. Patent Office

FROM: J. Paul Plummer Facsimile #713-431-4664
713-431-7360

DATE: January 11, 2005

RE: U. S. Application No. 10/633,134, filed August 1, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 2002.010

Total Number of Pages Transmitted (including this cover page) 5

Transmitted by: Margaret Gnewuch
If you do not receive a clear or complete transmission, please call 713-431-6346.

MESSAGE:

Following is a Response to Office Action Mailed December 6, 2004 (4 pages).

Notice Of Confidentiality

This communication contains information which is confidential and/or protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privilege. It is intended for receipt and use solely by the individual(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this communication to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this document is unauthorized and strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify **ExxonMobil Upstream Research Company** by telephone at (713) 431-6346, immediately, and return this document to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service.

JAN 11 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: J. R. O'Donnell et al.

§ Examiner: Stoner, Kiley S.

Filed: August 1, 2003

§ Art Unit: 1725

Serial No.: 10/633,134

§ Attorney Docket No.: 2002.010

Title: Toughness-Optimized Weld Joints and
Methods for Producing Said Weld
Joints

§ Confirmation No.: 3121

VIA FACSIMILE

January 11, 2005

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED DECEMBER 6, 2004

Sir:

The accompanying Introductory Comments, Amendments to the Claims and Remarks are offered in response to the Office Action mailed December 6, 2004.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

In the office action, the examiner rejected claim 2 as a product-by-process claim. Applicants wish to amend the claims to cancel claim 2.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims, which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 4 of this paper.